



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,979	11/29/2000	Johji Mamiya	JP9-1999-0267US1(8728-457	8978

46069 7590 08/10/2005  
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 WOODBURY ROAD  
WOODBURY, NY 11797

EXAMINER

SINGH, DALIP K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2671

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/725,979

**Applicant(s)**

MAMIYA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Dalip K. Singh

**Art Unit**

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-20 and 22-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 21 and 29-32 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's amendment dated April 11, 2005 in response to PTO Office Action dated January 7, 2005. The amendments to claim(s) 1; deletion of claims 5-20 and 22-28 and addition of new claims 29-32 have been noted and entered in the record, and applicant's remarks have been carefully considered resulting in the action as set forth herein below.
2. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. The indicated allowability of claim 21 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to May et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,828,383. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### **EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT**

4. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Nathaniel T. Wallace (Reg. No. 48,909), Attorney of Record, on July 21, 2005.

The application has been amended as follows:

In the claims:

In claim 30, line 1, delete "**13**"; and insert-**29**-.

In claim 31, line 1, delete "**13**"; and insert-**29**-.

In claim 32, line 1, delete "**13**"; and insert-**29**-.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim(s) 1, 2 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,150,996 to Nicholson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,441 B1 to Ludtke et al.

a. Regarding claims 1 and 29, Nicholson et al. **discloses** a host (sign controller 18, Fig. 11) for executing an application, the host comprising a pre-processor (processor 240, Fig. 11); and a display (display module 12, Fig. 13) connected to the host (sign controller 18), the display (display module 12) displaying an image, wherein said host (sign controller 18) transfers image data to the display (display module 227...controller 18 communicates to each display module 12...to address each display module 12 and display information on sign 10...col. 7, lines 39-67), said display (display module 12) includes a panel control processor (microprocessor 62, Fig. 13) for processing the image data, and a panel memory (memory 64) for storing processed image data (...memory 64 for storing bit map information of several images to be displayed on the display module 12...col. 12, lines 1-26), wherein the processed image data in the panel memory (memory 64) is displayed as the image. Nicholson et al. **discloses** addressing each display modules 12 (...sign controller 18 performs a sequence of operations illustrated as a block diagram...to address each...display module...resets the address of each display module...after addressing each display 12, sign controller 18 prepares to display information...col. 14, lines 7-67; col. 15, lines 1-45), the map block 320 creates a map of the addresses, map bit block 322 creates a display bit map for each address display module 12 and broadcast bit

Art Unit: 2671

assignment block 324 sends a control signal having a packet of information (...a packet of information containing the address and the appropriate display information for each display module 12...col. 15, lines 45-67). However, Nicholson et al. **is silent about** the packet of information having a specific header that identifies the panel control processor and a body including the image data. Ludtke et al. **discloses** a format of data packet for transmitting data from the host to the display device (...data packet includes a packet header and a data field or payload...packet header includes a data\_length field...the remaining data portion contains the actual video data payload...within...the packet...col. 17, lines 59-67; col. 18, lines 1-47). Ludtke et al. **further discloses** the master device 22 sending a configuration command to inform the display device which image section it is responsible for (...a configure command is utilized by a control device to...set up a multiple display configuration...device\_ID\_list //specifies a list of 1394 GUIDs, one for each display device to use...col. 19, lines 30-67; col. 20, lines 1-50). Fig. 4 of Ludtke et al. **discloses** display devices 24-40 configuration with a CPU 106 similar to the control processor recited in the instant claim limitations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Nicholson et al. with the feature “packetized data structure detailing a header identifying the panel specific processor and a body that includes the image data” as taught by Ludtke et al. **because** packetized image data provides for robust data transmission in digital format resulting in reduced data transmission errors and the capabilities for data error corrections.

b. Regarding claim 2, Nicholson et al. **discloses** wherein said display refreshes the image using image data stored in said panel memory (memory 64)(...transfer bit block 330 transfers the bit map information from memory 64 to message output portion 72 and to input message input 88 of the light driver 87...col. 16, lines 1-15).

Art Unit: 2671

7. Claim(s) 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,150,996 to Nicholson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,441 B1 to Ludtke et al. as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,383 to May et al.

a. Regarding claim 30, Nicholson-Ludtke combination **is silent** about receiving image data showing image data showing different display characteristics and data quantities. May et al. **discloses** processing of two types of display data, graphics and video. Also, May **discloses** different data quantities for two types of display data (...pixel depth correction circuit...accommodates the difference in the number of bytes per pixel between graphics data...and video...data...col. 6, lines 14-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Nicholson-Ludtke combination with the feature "two types of display data being processed and their storage in a common area of display memory" as taught by May et al. **because** it minimizes memory space requirements and maximize memory bandwidth for display data by allowing display data of different types to be stored in a common area of display memory (col. 3, lines 8-23).

b. Regarding claim 31, Nicholson et al. **discloses** said first panel control processor (microprocessor 62, Fig. 13) for processing the image data, and a panel memory (memory 64) for storing processed image data (...memory 64 for storing bit map information of several images to be displayed on the display module 12...col. 12, lines 1-26;...system comprises...a plurality of...modules...the modules are in communication with the sign controller to receive data...in conjunction with a plurality of other sign modules...col. 2, lines 55-67; col. 3, lines 1-1-40).

8. Claim(s) 3, 4 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,150,996 to Nicholson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,501,441 B1 to Ludtke et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,854 B1 to Knox et al.

Art Unit: 2671

- a. Regarding claims 3 and 4, Nicholson-Ludtke combination **is silent about** said host transfers image data showing a first resolution to said display and said display scales said transferred image data from having the first resolution to that having a second resolution. Knox et al. **discloses** as a means to reduce the bandwidth of data bus between host and said display, video data being sent as compressed data to the display where an interface then in turn decompresses the data for displaying purposes (...finally increasing resolution or color depth could be to some extent localized to the monitor rather than burdening the video controller...col. 3, lines 30-65...to reduce the bandwidth of data on the bus 210, preferably something less than the full uncompressed video data is transmitted from the video controller 200 the monitors 212...this compressed data is passed through a bus interface 305 over the bus 210 to the interface 214 within the monitor 212...the data is received in the interface 214 by a bus interface 306, where it is decompressed...col. 5, lines 10-67; col. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Nicholson-Ludtke combination with the feature “compressed data being uncompressed on the display side resulting in higher resolution images” as taught by Knox et al. **because** it reduces bandwidth requirement between the video controller/monitor interface and improves efficiency.
- b. Regarding claim 32, it is similar in scope to claim 3 above and is rejected under the same rationale.
9. Claim(s) 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,150,996 to Nicholson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,383 to May et al.
- a. Regarding claim 21, Nicholson et al. while disclosing a panel for displaying an image (...display module 227...controller 18 communicates to each display module 12...to address each display module 12 and display information on sign 10...col. 7, lines 39-67)

Art Unit: 2671

**is silent about** two types of display data and discriminating between two types of data based on identification bits written to memory. May et al. **discloses** a panel for displaying an image (display 804, Fig. 7); image data receiving means (display controller 700, Fig. 7) from a host side (Fig. 6 & 7) for receiving image data of the first number of bits and second number of bits different from the first number of bits (...graphics and video pixel data may be stored in one of number of formats...col. 4, lines 1-47). Claim 21 recites color image data and monochrome image data. May et al. **discloses** receiving graphics data or video data and the use of the ninth data bit being used as a tag bit (tag bit 610) to tag associated display data to indicate whether such data represents graphics or video information (col. 4, lines 12-25); and the fact that graphics and video pixel data may be stored in one of number of formats, for example, RGB 365 or YUV 4:2:2 (col. 4, lines 26-37); and further graphics formats using one, two, or three bytes per pixel and video formats may use one or two bytes per pixel similar to the instant claim limitation recitation (...color image data of the first number of bits...monochrome image data...number of bits different from the first number of bits...claim 21 lines 3-5). May et al. **discloses** tag bits that differentiates graphics or video data which is similar to the identification bits for discriminating between color and monochrome image data as recited in the instant claim limitation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Nicholson et al. with the feature "differentiating image data using identification bits as the data is written to the memory and making use of these identification bits for different data format processing" as taught by May et al. **because** it minimizes memory space requirements and maximize memory bandwidth for display data by allowing display data of different types to be stored in a common area of display memory (col. 3, lines 8-23).



Art Unit: 2671

***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Dalip K. Singh** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7792**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday (10:30AM-6:30PM).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Ulka Chauhan**, can be reached at **(571) 272-7782**.

Art Unit: 2671

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dalip K. Singh  
Examiner, Art Unit 2676

dks  
August 8, 2005

  
ULKA J. CHAUHAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER